



**STATE OF WASHINGTON**

**PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR STANDARDS BOARD**

*Old Capitol Building, 600 Washington Street, Room 249 • P. O. Box 47236 • Olympia, WA 98504-7236  
Main (360) 725-6275 • Assessment (360) 725-6274*

**September 24, 2002**

**Members Present:**

Carolyn Bradley, Chair	Terry Bergeson
Beverly Cheney	Nancy Diaz-Miller
Ken Evans	Sheila Fox
Tim Knue	Gloria Mitchell
Kathryn Nelson	Helen Nelson-Throssell
Martha Rice	Ron Scutt
Karen Simpson	Dennis Sterner
Yvonne Ullas	

**Members Absent:**

Rebecca Bowers	Carol Coar
----------------	------------

**Staff Present:**

Jennifer Wallace	Pamela Abbott
David Anderson	

Carolyn Bradley, PESB Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. Chair Bradley welcomed Beverly Cheney, Superintendent, South Kitsap School District and Gloria Mitchell, Principal, T.T. Minor Elementary School, as new members of the PESB.

**AGENDA**

The Board reviewed and approved the agenda.

**MINUTES**

**MOTION:** Moved by Tim Knue and seconded by Martha Rice to approve the July 2002 Minutes. **The motion passed unanimously.**

**CREATING A NEW CAREER AND COMPENSATION STRUCTURE FOR  
EDUCATORS: NEXT STEPS FOR WASHINGTON**

Dr. Allan Odden from University of Wisconsin, Consortium for Policy Research in Education provided a presentation on alternative compensation models.

A copy of his presentation may be obtained from the PESB office.

## Questions from Board Members/Answers from Dr. Odden

What about current teachers?

Grandfather in seasoned teachers.

- 1/3 or half the teachers are assessed in the year.
- Redlined no salary cut. You have to wait until you end up in the right category.

What about the experience of mid-career professionals?

*Instructional expertise is important, and content knowledge isn't everything. You could place mid-career professionals where you wanted to, and then it would be up to that person to go through an assessment to prove it. This doesn't act as a barrier of who you are just a barrier of what you do or don't have. If they do not pass the assessment, you could drop them down.*

Are you saying if we've got a chance we should change the whole model?

*A redesign will get more public attention. If you want more money, you might want big public attention. Steamboat Springs had a 20% increase over 3 years.*

Special education teachers often don't teach to units. How will they be assessed?

*There is a separate set of standards for people who teach students with disabilities.*

With a knowledge-based system, don't you have to continually assess to avoid a ceiling effect? How do you set an appropriate measure of growth for a new teacher?

*There is a top salary and there is going to be a top salary, but for a new person coming in, we are trying to set a level of practice.*

You said you need to identify a set of goals or an appropriate amount of growth. In some schools you will reach a situation where there is not much room to grow?

*In this instance, some schools set goals to get 25% of their teachers to and advanced level.*

Once a person meets the advanced level, what happens if he/she is no longer performing at that level next year?

*If performance falls, their salary falls.*

Dr. Odden suggested the Board contact Dr. Dan Goldhaber at the University of Washington. Dr. Goldhaber is one of the top labor economists in the country and has worked with Dr. Odden at the NEA/AFT meetings on compensation and compensation structure.

## **DRAFT LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL FOR RECOGNITION AND SERVICE COMPENSATION FOR TRAINED MENTOR TEACHERS**

OSPI has begun to draft legislation on mentor teachers; specifically, how we train select, allocate and compensate mentor teachers. The PESB Executive Committee had a chance to comment on this proposal.

Superintendent Bergeson discussed OSPI's legislative request with the Board.  
Superintendent Bergeson's definition of the mentor role:

1. *Someone who is enhancing the ability of someone to teach and thus improves student learning.*
2. *Someone who is free to be a helper; a colleague who knows more and won't hold it over his/her mentee.*

### **Legislative Proposal:**

#### **Year One – Design Year**

- How do we get the mentor role in place?
- How do we get funding for the first year to pull a group of people together to answer some of these questions.
  - The group would be strong existing mentors and others with different kinds of experiences to decide what would be the skills set of a mentor?
- Questions to be answered by this group:
  - What would be the experiences a person should go through and how should those skills be demonstrated?
  - What kind of performance assessment should be done?
  - What should they do to help bring a staff together around the goals?
  - What will the curriculum look like to become a mentor?
  - Once they have become mentors, when would they get the additional pay?
  - How do we get the money to the districts to pay a certain number of mentor teachers?
    - Enough flexibility in the system to allow districts and schools could personalize the model to what they need.
  - How do they get assessed and how do they get paid?

#### **Year Two**

- Begin implementing the mentor training.
- Quality control over very powerful experiences so we end up with a very strong cadre of teachers designing and redesigning the system.
- Would like to see teachers spending 2-3 weeks in the summer reflecting on what they have learned during the year and have the mentors design the curriculum materials, so that part of their year would be a learning and development time separate from the work they did as mentors so they can become the development cadre for the future.

#### **Year Three –**

- Should have built a strong cadre of mentors
- A clear path and curriculum for others to become mentors.

## **REPORT FROM THE PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATE STUDY COMMITTEE**

At the November or January meeting, the PESB will invite people from different constituent groups to come and participate as part of the panel on the professional certificate.

### **EMERGING LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS**

#### **Service credit for Educational Staff Associates (ESAs)**

##### **Issue:**

ESA's do not receive full time credit towards retirement for working part-time as others in TERS1. According to current RCW public school districts or community college employees in an instructional position and employed less than full time in the teacher retirement system may elect to have their earnable compensation defined, for purposes of retirement, as the compensation the member would have received if the position were full time. Our issue is that educational staff associates play a very valuable role and many of them are in instructional roles.

##### **Problem:**

RCW defines instructional position as a position where 75% of the member's time is spent as a classroom instructor or a librarian or counselor. Looked at the history of the legislation.

##### **Proposed Solution:**

Senator Fraser suggested the PESB send a letter to Senator Don Carlson the chair of the Joint Committee on Pension Policy (JCPP) raising this issue and letting him know of the Board's concern. Senator Fraser also suggested the Board reiterate what they believe is important about the role of the ESAs and ask the JCPP consider a change in RCW.

This change would only affect ESAs under the TERS 1 retirement system.

**MOTION:** Moved and seconded to send a letter to the JCPP on the ESA service credit issue. **The motion passed unanimously.**

#### **Out of Endorsement Assignment**

- Legislature and staff are paying close attention to out of endorsement area assignments.
  - In current WAC, the first two chapters allow local districts with a number of exemptions and waivers. When a district doesn't meet any of those provisions, the districts must go to the State Board of Education to obtain a waiver.
- ESEA has really strict guidelines around what districts must to do assign out of endorsement area teachers.
  - Parents must be notified if their child's teacher is teaching out of endorsement.

OSPI is working on an online certification system. There is hope that this might also be a way to report teacher assignments.

### **Alternative Routes –**

- Applied jointly with OSPI for additional funds from the Department of Education.
  - If we receive the US Department of Education grant, we will receive funding for three years of actual interns.
  - This grant will provide for \$5000 for interns and \$500 for mentors.
  - This round of funding would also allow for paraeducators with BA degrees to participate.
  - We should know if we've received funding by late October.
- Jennifer has started having discussions with staff at OFM, OSPI, the Governor's office, and some Legislators around additional funding for Alternative Routes.
  - We've worked hard at developing a regional certification centers model (Route 4).
  - Legislative feedback - request state level funds for alternative routes.
    - This would require a change to E2SSB 5695 in that the program was supposed to sunset.

### **Retire/Rehire**

Ken Evans discussed the issue of retire/rehire legislation. Ken feels the retire/rehire legislation has some impact on the recruitment and retention of teachers.

ESSB5937 passed the legislature during the 2001-second special session with overwhelming support.

- 39-0 in the Senate
- 84-1 in the House

This piece of legislation allows people to retire and continue to work up to 1500 hours a year.

The Governor vetoed the portion of the bill that called for a sunset of this legislation in 2004. In the Governor's veto statement, he stated:

*The State is facing a critical shortage of experienced teachers and other employees with skills in high demand. In order to meet this shortage we need to attract retirees back to work.*

### **Questions to consider:**

- Are we going to have enough teachers and administrators?
- Is it accomplishing the goal of retaining teachers in key classroom settings?
- How will it affect recruitment and retention of teachers...will it have a negative impact?
- Will the perception of the public be negative enough that it will have an impact where they will fail levies and have a backlash to the education system.

**Proposed policy statement:**

Requesting from the legislature whether school districts are complying with the intent of ESSB5937 and we might do that by amending the bill to require more data collection on the number of teachers, their endorsements, number of administrators, superintendents, classified people, school districts and schools, geographical area of this as well as maybe including something more about accountability for districts.

Superintendent Bergeson explained the purpose of the legislation was to keep people who were going to leave Washington after 30 years because their retirement is capped. Superintendent Bergeson also feels that if the separation period is removed, the mis-information that is out there now would not exist and the State would have more people retiring. Superintendent Bergeson believes if we open this issue, we have a risk of losing the option entirely.

**No motion for action at this time.**

**UPDATE ON WEST-B IMPLEMENTATION**

David Anderson provided an update on the WEST-B.

- First Test administration was August 24<sup>th</sup>.
- 253 examinees at 7 test centers.

**Scoring process**

- Marker paper meeting.
  - Educators looked at the responses to the writing prompts to provide information to help scorers.
  - Looked at responses and helped translate the rubric.
- National Evaluation Systems then scored the writing prompts.
- Multiple-choice tests were scored electronically.
- Following the scoring of the responses, we conducted the standard setting panel. Based on their ratings of each item the panel provided recommendations for the cut scores for each section of the WEST-B.

**Cut Score**

- NES will go over the process the panel used to come up with those recommendations.
- The Board will evaluate the Standard Setting Panel's recommendation and adopt a cut score during the second day of this meeting.

**Score reporting**

- NES will generate score reports after the board has adopted the cut score.
- Two-day meeting.
- Discussion about purpose of the WEST-B and the impact of the test.

- Went through a detailed process approved by the TAC and discussed their individual and group judgments.
  - The standard setting panel was charged with looking at each item on the test.
  - Each panel member took the test so they understood what the examinees experienced.
- Item by item reviewed how the items met the test objective.
- At the end of the process we asked for an evaluation.

### **Future activities**

- Next test administration
  - November 16, 2002
- Continuing the development of test items and writing prompts for the WEST-B.
  - NES heard very clearly that the prompts and examples need to be representative of the different heritages and groups in Washington.
  - Need to have different test items on the test at each administration.
- We will analyze the data so we can better understand the impact of the testing program and see how the WEST-B affects different groups in Washington.
- Want to evaluate how well we are meeting the needs of the examiners and the teacher preparation programs of the state.
  - Part of that decision is to evaluate other test scores from different tests.

### **TAC Recommendations**

The TAC had some very specific recommendations.

Sheila and Ken and John and Rebecca NES, were at the meeting.

Recommendations should be considered as options to adopt.

### **Weighting of the writing prompt responses and the multiple-choice portion of the WEST-B Writing Sub Test.**

Consider three options

1. 1/6 of the score from the writing prompt responses and 5/6 from the multiple choice items
  - Weighting corresponds to the test objectives and is related to the results of the content validation survey
  - Modest emphasis on the writing prompt responses
  - Acceptable reliability
2. ½ of the score from the writing prompt responses and ½ from the multiple-choice items
  - Recommended by the Content Advisory Committee
  - Emphasizes writing prompt responses
  - Reliability depends equally upon the less and more reliable portions of the test
3. 1/3 of the score from the writing prompt responses and 2/3 from the multiple-choice items
  - Acknowledges the importance of writing prompt responses
  - Recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee
  - Acceptable reliability

**MOTION:** Moved by Sheila Fox, seconded by Tim Knue to accept the recommendations of the TAC and weight the constructed response of the writing portion of the test at 1/3 and the multiple choice portion of the writing test at 2/3. **The motion passed.**

### **Standard setting process**

#### **TAC recommendations:**

- Conduct standard setting meeting over two days
- There should be no compensation across subtests.
- Candidates must meet the minimum score on each subtest.
- Instruct Panelist to consider the basic skills needed by all entry-level teachers.
- Provide feedback to the panel concerning the difficulty of the test items
- Use a compensatory model to determine the total score for the writing subtest of the WEST-B.

**MOTION:** Moved by Sheila Fox, seconded by Gloria Mitchell to approve the TAC recommendation not to allow compensation across subtests. **The motion passed.**

**MOTION:** Moved by Tim Knue, seconded by Kay Nelson to use a compensatory model to determine the total score for the Writing subtest of the WEST-B. **The motion passed.**

### **Adoption of passing scores by the Board**

#### **TAC Recommendations**

- Establish a policy of re-visiting passing scores over time. Re-examine passing scores at the end of the first year and every five years thereafter.
- Consider the potential passing rates associated with various cut score options.

**MOTION:** Moved by Ron Scutt, seconded by Yvonne Ullas to establish a policy of re-visiting passing scores over time. Re-examine the cut scores at the end of the first year, end of the second year and every five years thereafter

**MOTION:** Moved by Tim Knue, seconded by Dennis Sterner to amend the original motion to read, "Re-examine the cut scores at the end of the first year, and every five years after with an optional review at the end of the second year based on the need for larger group numbers and or larger sub-group numbers."

**Both motions passed unanimously**

### **Score Reporting**

#### **TAC Recommendations**

- Do not report test objective level scores to individuals
- Report test objective level scores at the aggregate, not individual, level to institutions on a yearly basis



**MOTION:** Moved by Gloria Mitchell, seconded by Sheila Fox to accept the recommendation of not reporting test objective level scores to individuals and to report test objective level scores at the aggregate, not individual, level to institutions on a yearly basis. **The motion passed unanimously.**

### **Policy Issues Regarding Number of Retakes Allowed and “Shelf Life” of Candidates Scores**

**MOTION:** Moved by Gloria Mitchell, seconded by Nancy Diaz-Miller not to place a shelf life on the WEST-B and to allow unlimited retakes on the WEST-B. **Motion withdrawn.**

**MOTION:** Moved by Yvonne Ullas to allow unlimited retakes on the WEST-B and not consider a shelf life. **Motion withdrawn.**

**MOTION:** Moved by Yvonne Ullas, seconded by Gloria Mitchell to allow unlimited retakes of the WEST-B. **Motion passed unanimously.**

**MOTION:** Moved by Martha Rice, seconded by Ken Evans not to place a shelf life on a passing score of the WEST-B subtests. **The motion failed with six members voting in favor and seven voting against.**

### **EVENING SESSION – REVIEW OF STANDARD SETTING PROCESS**

Dr. John Mattar from NES reviewed the standard setting process the panel used. The following is a summary of Dr. Mattar’s comments

The standard setting process is a systematic process in collecting and compiling judgments.

Items are reviewed one at a time and each judge looked at each item twice; once without data and then once with data.

Each panel member took test without interruption without a key

- Critical that the experts don’t see the answers right away

Panel members then made item-based validity judgments

- Asked them to make an individual judgment
- Asked them to verify the answer was correct
- Asked them to make sure it was free from potential bias, that it was related to the job of a beginning teacher, and that it met the test objectives

Panel members then reviewed each item and were asked to think about people just at the level of knowledge required of a beginning teacher would answer the item correctly.

Panel members were asked to think about the minimum score for passing.

- What defines a passing score?
- What percentage of the group would answer the question correctly?
- Rating the relativity of that question for that group of people.

Standard setting panel was made up of 23 people

- 1/3 represented higher education
- 2/3 other educational settings
- 30% represented ethnic groups

Dr. Mattar passed out and explained the score reports.

The Board discussed whether the test is testing for admission to teacher preparation programs at the colleges and universities or if the test is testing for certification. The law states the test will be used for both purposes. The main argument to use this test for admission to a teacher preparation program was that these programs did not want to remediate students. The programs felt they should have basic skills prior to admission.

Teacher preparation programs may conditionally admit students who haven't passed the WEST-B on a case-by-case basis as outlined in the law.

Dr. Mattar reviewed the following with the Board members:

- Panel recommended scores
- Possible adjustments
- Preliminary pass rates based on various cut scores.

The Board members reviewed the WEST-B.

### ***September 25, 2002***

<b>Members Present:</b>	Carolyn Bradley, Chair Carol Coar Ken Evans Tim Knue Kathryn Nelson Martha Rice Karen Simpson Yvonne Ullas	Beverly Cheney Nancy Diaz-Miller Sheila Fox Gloria Mitchell Helen Nelson-Throssell Ron Scutt Dennis Sterner
-------------------------	---	---

**Members Absent:** Rebecca Bowers

<b>Staff Present:</b>	Jennifer Wallace David Anderson	Pamela Abbott
-----------------------	------------------------------------	---------------

Carolyn Bradley called the meeting to order at 8:35 am.

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Kay Nelson will serve on Executive Committee and is replacing Tom Charouhas.  
Dennis Sterner will be replacing Sheila Fox.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

## **FORMAL ADOPTION – WEST-B TIME EXTENSION FOR OUT-OF-STATE APPLICANTS FOR RESIDENCY TEACHING CERTIFICATE.**

**MOTION:** Moved by Martha Rice, seconded by Carol Coar to adopt WAC 181-01-01. WEST-B Exemption. Individuals applying for a Washington State residency teaching certificate who have completed teacher preparation program in another state or country have up to one calendar year from issuance of temporary permit to pass the WEST-B basic skills test, provided that they have completed all other requirements for residency certification other than passage of the WEST-B and are thus eligible for a temporary permit under WAC 180-79A-128. **The motion passed unanimously.**

WAC 181-01-01 will be submitted to the Code Revisor as adopted by the PESB.

## **TECHNICAL AND POLICY ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH SETTING THE PASSING SCORE ON THE WEST-B**

Stephen Kline, of the Rand Corporation presented on the setting of the cut score. Highlights of Dr. Kline's presentation are included below:

### **Issues:**

- High stakes tests make people nervous
- Test is an artificial situation, not what they will do in a normal setting, however it is important to them

### **Two kinds of errors:**

- Passing someone who should fail
  - If you pass someone who should fail that is the end.
- Failing someone who should pass
  - If you fail someone who should pass, they can take the test again.

Dr. Klein believes people change their behavior in response to setting a standard. When you raise the bar, you can change the behavior.

### **Impact**

- Overall
- Special groups

Dr. Klein advised the Board not to set a passing score to achieve a passing rate. When this is done, the choice looks arbitrary and capricious.

What you put on your examination and the standards you have on your examination will trickle down to influence what students take during their teacher preparation.

NES performed a careful job analysis then went through a process where the content advisory committee and the fairness committee looked at the data and looked at the content validation survey by Washington educators. The TAC was there to make sure the process NES used was a sound process for collecting that data.

Dr. Klein feels less weight should be put on impact data.

Carol Coar reminded the Board that the people who were on the content validation and fairness committees were well representative of ethnic and minority groups in the State. She also emphasized that the fairness committee wanted to make sure the test is fair to all groups while making sure we have standards.

Dr. Klein reviewed the passing score options. Dr. Klein reminded the Board that they are aiming for the target. The more important rate is the eventual passing rate.

**MOTION:** Moved by Carol Coar, seconded by Nancy Diaz-Miller to accept the passing score set by the panel, remembering it is written language 11 written multiple choice 31, reading and math 37 based on the time and effort they put in.

**Reasons to vote against this motion:**

- There are a lot of unknowns at this point
- We don't know if the committee took into account the SEM
- We know the test isn't perfect and that the reliability coefficient is somewhere around .9
- If we do set the score too low this year, we will be able to adjust the score next year
- We can take into consideration the panel's recommendation and lower it by 1 standard error of measurement
- Members expressed not wanting to lower the standard next year

**MOTION:** Moved and seconded to divide the motion into reading, math, writing prompt and writing multiple choice. **The motion passed with nine members voting for, two voting against and 2 abstentions.**

**Discussion in favor of adopting 37 as the passing score on the reading subtest:**

- Those who looked at the test items were from all types of groups and looked at the basic level of knowledge that is needed.
- They looked at what they believed was the basic level of knowledge a beginning teacher should have.
- What do they have to know?
- What is acceptable writing?

**Vote to adopt 37 as the passing score for the reading subtest on the WEST-B:**

- 6 for, 8 against
- **The motion failed**

**MOTION:** Moved by Tim Knue, seconded by Gloria Mitchell to adopt the passing score of 34 on the reading subtest of the WEST-B.

**Vote to adopt 34 as the passing score for the reading subtest on the WEST-B:**

- 8 for, 5 against, 1 abstention
- **The motion passed**

## **MATH CUT SCORE:**

### **Vote to adopt 37 as the passing score for the math subtest on the WEST-B:**

- 5 for, 9 against
- **The motion failed**

**MOTION:** Moved by Yvonne Ullas, seconded by Helen Nelson-Throssell to adopt the passing score of 34 on the math subtest of the WEST-B.

### **Vote to adopt 34 as the passing score for the math subtest on the WEST-B:**

- 9 for, 4 against and 1 abstention
- **The motion passed**

## **WRITING TEST**

**MOTION:** Approve 11 as the passing score for the constructed response portion of the writing section. **The motion passed unanimously.**

### **Vote to adopt 31 as the passing score for the multiple-choice section of the writing subtest on the WEST-B:**

- 7 for, 7 against and 1 abstention
- **The chair chose not to break the tie, thus the motion failed.**

**MOTION:** Moved by Dennis Sterner, seconded by Kay Nelson to adopt 28 as the passing score for the multiple choice section of the writing subtest on the WEST-B and move it into alignment with the cut scores of the reading and math subtests.

### **Vote to adopt 28 as the passing score for the multiple-choice section of the writing subtest on the WEST-B:**

- 7 for, 5 against, 3 abstentions
- **The motion passed**

The Board members asked Jennifer to prepare a unified statement that reflects the Board fully appreciated and understood the standard setting panel's recommendation, but that we had other factors to consider that the standard setting panel did not. The Board also expressed the need for the statement to reflect that we will have a chance to adjust the score next year.

The passing score decisions will be posted to the website.

## **UPDATE ON THE WEST – E (PRAXIS)**

Lori Ingwersen from ETS provided a short overview on the progress of the WEST-E.

## **Next Step Activities**

- Test at a glance
- Need to isolate which tests will be looked at and validated in the state of Washington
- 31 of the 33 areas have multiple-choice assessments. In some areas, there are several assessments
- The Board will need to decide if they want to use just multiple-choice or a combination of multiple-choice and constructed response

Lori Ingwerson will be in Washington in December to review live tests with assessment and curriculum staff at OSPI to analyze and make recommendations to the Board of the assessments that best fit with Washington State.

ETS is also working with the certification office at OSPI to identify potential panel members that also worked on the Washington State endorsement competencies.

In January, 2003, ETS will have recommendations about which test to use.

The standard setting committee will be comprised of 15 people per endorsement area with 2-7 years of teaching experience as well as regional, ethnic and gender diversities. At the May 2003 meeting, ETS will have a report about the test.

In the future the Board will:

- Determine if it is fair for someone to take more than one test
- Set guidelines
- Determine proper test use
- Establish test centers

## **Timeline**

- Working now to establish pilot information and be ready to have these tests available September 1, 2003
- Test becomes a requirement for certification September 1, 2005

The WEST-E could have policy implications well beyond the use for certification. We are working with the State Board of Education about other policy issues, involving the use of the WEST-E.

Master's In Teaching and Post Baccalaureate programs are looking to use the WEST-E to verify one's knowledge of their content area. If the SBE established in WAC that the WEST-E fulfills the knowledge requirement, programs may be able to recommend endorsements for candidates seeking certification in an area they not offer as an endorsement at their institution.

There may be technical validity issues, and right now we don't know much about the PRAXIS other than it will be used for certification. The TAC will advise the Board on the appropriateness for other uses as well as the validity of options and how that would affect our major program.

## **Current Mission and Vision**

In an attempt to be proactive rather than reactive, the Executive Committee members expressed interest in attending OSPI and State Board Meetings. According to the PESB mission, are to advise and provide recommendations to the SBE, OSPI, Governor and Legislature. This is something the Board is not currently doing. By attending the meetings of OSPI and the SBE, it will change the way we do business and will allow us to weigh in on issues and carry out our advisory role to OSPI and the SBE.

Board members discussed having those who live in the area attend the meetings.

Jennifer has also been attending and presenting at meetings of the PESB constituencies. (WES, WASA, AWSP, PTA, etc.) If the Board members attend with Jennifer, it shows Jennifer is representing the Board and we are representing our constituency as a Board member.

**MOTION:** Moved by Tim Knue, seconded by Yvonne Ullas that the Board support the current vision and mission.

The vision is something you don't attain. The mission is the purpose and function of the Board. The Executive Committee discussed changing these to express what the Board does well.

**MOTION:** Moved by Carol Coar, seconded by Kay Nelson to amend the original motion by changing the second bullet of the mission to:  
*"Oversee effectiveness of new basic skills and subject matter assessments to be required of all new teachers prior to state certification."*

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Vote to approve main motion: Motion passes unanimously.**

**MOTION:** Moved by Tim Knue, seconded by Nancy Diaz-Miller to adopt the proposed new operating principle as written and with small edit change. **The motion passed unanimously.**

## **NEW OPERATING PRINCIPLE:**

To more clearly define the parameters and emphasis of the PESB work in order to be effective and visible to our constituents, the Executive Committee recommends that the following operating principle be added:

- PESB members will accept responsibility for attending SBE meetings and relevant OSPI meetings to identify professional educator issues of interest to the PESB and to enhance the communication links between these entities and the PESB.
- Develop position statements for OSPI, SBE, Governor and Legislature on selected professional education issues we determine to be within the purview of the PESB.

The goals and workplan will be developed by the executive committee and brought to full Board next meeting.

## **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT**

Carolyn Bradley and Jennifer Wallace attended the meeting of the partner states of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. By attending this conference, they were able to give input into NCTAF's next report. Washington's Alternative Routes will be an exemplary feature in one of the chapters of the report. The report advises policymakers to end the debate about alternative route versus traditional route preparation and focus on upholding high standards of the profession.

### **Upcoming conferences and opportunities.**

The Professional Education Advisory Board (PEAB) Conference will be held October 18, 2002. Karen Simpson and Carol Coar will participate in a discussion about ESA standards. Jennifer Wallace, David Anderson and Carolyn Bradley will present on the work of the Board.

Washington Association for Colleges of Teacher Education (WACTE) –The WACTE Executive Committee requested that the PESB higher education members “engage in a conversation” about the work of the PESB at the October WACTE meeting.

### **Legislature**

The report on implementation of the basic skills and content knowledge tests is due to the Governor, Legislature, Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction and the State Board of Education on December 1<sup>st</sup>, 2002 the same date as the Annual Report is due.

### **Alternative Routes**

Jennifer met with the Governor's communication office about hosting a joint event to visit alternative route interns in the classroom.

On September 10<sup>th</sup>, a meeting with the Alternative Route Partnerships and the Transition to Teaching Partnerships was held. At the meeting, the partnerships discussed many challenges and successes they have had. Other issues discussed were: new insight into the employment relationships, how the money is distributed, mentor selection and placement, development of a common job description, and how to operate this program in the future.

Partnerships are just now feeling secure enough to share documents with each other. We hope this will allow us to develop guidebooks in the future.

The districts have required a high level of communication and partnerships are varied in cost, pull-out time, and awarding of credits.

We will be requesting additional funds for the alternative routes program at a much lower level of funding. However, the report of the Washington State Institute for Public Policy will affect the way we go about the legislation to secure additional funding.



### **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

The PESB members called an executive session to discuss the annual performance evaluation of the Executive Director.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4pm.

### **NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the PESB will be November 12-13, 2002 in Burien, Washington.